

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the final office action mailed February 28, 2008. In the office action the Examiner:

- rejected claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-20, 22-24, 27-30, 32-33, 35-46, 48-49 and 51-58 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Breese et al.* (US 6,006,218) in view of *Konig et al.* (US 6,981,040);
- rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Breese* in view of *Konig*, further in view of *Gerace* (US 5,848,396);
- rejected claims 8, 34, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Breese* in view of *Konig*, further in view of *Gabriel et al.* (US 6,584,468); and
- rejected claims 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Breese* in view of *Konig*, further in view of *Dumais et al.* (US 2004/0267700).

Applicants have amended claims 1-4, 6-8, 14-20, 27, 32, 42, 43-46 and 48-58. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 18, 27 and 43 can be found at least in Figure 2 and corresponding discussion in the specification as originally filed, specifically in paragraph 0031. New claim 59 has been added. Support for new claim 59 can be found at least in claim 5 as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

With respect to all amendments, Applicants have not dedicated or abandoned any unclaimed subject matter. Moreover, Applicants have not acquiesced to any characterizations of the invention, nor any rejections or objections of the claims, made by the Examiner. After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 1-4, 6-30, 32-46 and 48-59.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 18, 27 and 43.

Claim 1, as amended, requires: “accessing a user profile for a user based on user information ... wherein the *user information includes information derived from anchor text contained in documents that link to the documents accessed by the user...*” (Emphasis Added).

Indeed, as discussed the specification as filed, using “information derived from anchor text contained in documents that link to the documents accessed by the user” can provide useful hits about the user’s personal search preferences:

Similarly, the universal resource locators (URL) 203 associated with the search results in response to the previous search queries and their corresponding anchor texts 205, especially for search result items that have been selected or “visited” by the user (e.g., downloaded or otherwise viewed by the user), are helpful in determining the user’s preferences. (Paragraph 0031 of the specification as filed).

In contrast, *Breese* discloses estimating a probability that items included in search results are already known to the user. (*Breese*, Abstract). *Breese* uses such factors as “information on the user’s actual knowledge, and information 522 about previously conducted searches and/or previous user actions.” (*Breese*, col. 5, lines 29-33). But, *Breese* is silent about and does not teach or suggest using “information derived from anchor text contained in documents that link to the documents accessed by the user,” as required by the claim, as amended.

Konig discloses initializing and updating a user model that represents the user’s information and product interests. (*Konig*, col. 17, lines 48-51). Documents that are of interest to the user and documents that are not of interest to the user are parsed and analyzed to obtain: (i) a set of words and phrases; (ii) images, (iii) links to other documents, email addresses, monetary sums, people's names, and company names, and (iv) document locations. (*Konig*, col. 17, line 51 to col. 18, line 6; Figure 13). But, like *Breese*, *Konig* is silent about and does not teach or suggest using “information derived from anchor text contained in documents that link to the documents accessed by the user,” as required by the claim, as amended.

Further, none of *Gerace*, *Gabriel* and *Dumais* supplies the missing limitations. None of *Gerace*, *Gabriel* and *Dumais* teaches or suggests “accessing a user profile for a user based on user information, ... wherein the *user information includes information derived from anchor text contained in documents that link to the documents accessed by the user*,” as required by claim 1.

As none of the cited references teach each and every limitation of claim 1, claim 1 (and associated dependent claims) are patentable over the cited references. Independent

claims 18, 27 and 43 (and associated dependent claims) are also patentable over the cited references for analogous reasons as those discussed with reference to claim 1.

In addition, with respect to claim 18 and its dependent claims, (as explained in more detail below) *Breeze* and *Konig* do not teach (A) “generating a personalized query strategy from the search query and the user profile;” and then (B) “selecting a personalized set of documents from the Internet according to the personalized query strategy.” In both *Breeze* and *Konig*, personalized information is used only to “post process” results produced by a search engine in response to a search query. See, for example, Fig. 19 of *Konig* and Fig. 2C (operations 230, 231 and 234, in that order) of *Breeze*. In *Breeze*, the very name of the “retrieval result adjusting module” 134, as well as the explanatory text at col. 6, ln 60-66, and col. 12, lines 32-48, teaches that the retrieval result adjusting module 134 of *Breeze* ranks or re-ranks search results. But there is no discussion in *Breeze* whatsoever about changing the search query or search query strategy used to produce a list of search results.

It is noted that in claim 18, the personalized search query is generated prior to “selecting a personalized set of documents” because the “selecting” is performed “according to the personalized search strategy.” Also, claim 18 requires the “personalized search strategy” is generated not just from the user profile, but also “from the search query.” These aspects of claim 18, and its dependent claims, are not taught by *Breeze* and *Konig*. For at least these additional reasons, claim 18 and its dependent claims are patentable over the combined teaches of the cited references.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions asserted by the examiner, the Applicants do not necessarily acquiesce in other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicants’ arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-4000, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 21, 2008

/ Gary S. Williams /

31,066

Gary S. Williams

(Reg. No.)

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

2 Palo Alto Square

3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700

Palo Alto, CA 94306

(650) 843-4000